

RACHEL FOX.

[To accompany bill H. R. No. 790.]

JANUARY 30, 1857.

Mr. BROOM, from the Committee on Revolutionary Pensions, made the following

R E P O R T .

*The Committee on Revolutionary Pensions, to whom the petition and papers in the case of Rachel Fox, widow of William Fox, were referred, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to report:*

That the claimant sets forth in her petition that long before, and during the revolutionary war, she resided in her uncle's family, (Col. George Miller,) in the village of Germantown, county of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; that on the 4th October, 1777, and during the time in which the battle was fought at Germantown in that year, and as she was standing at the door of the house of her uncle, an American officer, wounded and faint with loss of blood, staggered in and besought her to give him a drink of water, which she hastened to do, and when she returned with a pitcher full, she found him so weak and exhausted that she was obliged to hold it to his lips, and whilst in the act of so doing, she was assaulted by a gigantic Scotchman, a soldier in the British army, who attempted to insult her, and she resisting he drew a broadsword and struck her across the shoulder to about half-way between it and the elbow, inflicting a deep and dangerous wound. Immediately after the wound was received, a British officer passed by, and having seen the attack, ordered him under guard, and sent for a surgeon of the English army, who dressed the wound. This wound left the arm disabled to a great extent in the early part of her life, causing much pain, and, ultimately, it became paralyzed. That the husband of said Rachel Fox was also a soldier in the war of the revolution, from the beginning to the end of the same, at intervals. That his service was rendered only as a draughted militia man, or as a substitute for some one else, but never as an enlisted soldier. That he served under Captain Humphrey Williams, and under Captain William Renshaw, and was at the battles of Brandywine, Paoli, Germantown, Elizabethtown, Princeton, New Brunswick, and other places which she does not now recollect; that her said husband died many years ago, at the age of eighty-four, without ever

having received any bounty from government, and that she has never received any bounty, either from the State of Pennsylvania or from the general government. She now prays that, in consideration of the services of her husband and the wound she has received, from which she never recovered, that your honorable bodies will place her name on the pension list, or grant her such additional aid as may seem proper.

She accompanies her statement with the affidavit of "Dr. A. M. Cassidy, surgeon of the 69th regiment of the Pennsylvania militia," who corroborates the same as to the nature and extent of the wound she received, and states that it is four inches in breadth, and that from the same it has produced a total paralysis of the arm.

There are three other witnesses, each of whom testify to the high respectability of Rachel Fox and her husband, William Fox, and of the condition of her arm; who state that they have known her for many years, and believe that from the statements frequently made by the said Rachel Fox and her husband that it was produced as aforesaid.

These witnesses also state that they have frequently heard William Fox, the husband of the petitioner, speak of the incidents and circumstances relative to the battles through which he had passed; that he was at the battles of Germantown, Paoli, Brandywine, Princeton, and others, and that they are fully satisfied of the truthfulness of these statements.

Your committee are satisfied as to the credibility of the statements of the claimant, and that she is entitled to the favorable consideration of Congress, both on account of the service of her said husband and that of the wound she received while in the discharge of so humane a duty as that of rendering aid to a wounded American officer, in consequence of which she has been made a cripple for life.

Congress originally provided pensions for those of the revolutionary soldiers who should become disabled by wounds in the service of their country.

Your committee can draw no equitable distinction between the case in point and that of a soldier, and in view of the peculiar circumstances of the case, viz: that of the misfortune she suffers, in connexion with the fact that her husband had been a soldier for a long time, they would recommend that her name be placed on the pension roll, under the act of 4th July, 1836, to continue during her natural life, and for this purpose report a bill.